

and take another look at what he and his foreign policy team are trying to force the Israeli Government to do.

There cannot be peace until there is a change of heart. I returned from this trip with a newfound concern for the future of Israel. I saw examples of incitement. I heard examples of persecution and hatred being taught throughout Palestinian society by their leaders. When the people engaged in peace talks return from the negotiating table only to disparage compromise and incite violence, there can be no progress towards peace.

Israel has come a long way since I first began following the fate of this state and the people of Israel. In so many respects, life appears and feels normal. The economy is developing, the standard of living is growing and improving. But just below the surface of this normalcy, Mr. President, Israel still faces a threat to the state's very existence. Israel's survival remains, unfortunately, a very real and central concern 50 years after its independence.

Some people believe, however, that by ignoring this threat, that the peace process can succeed. Mr. President, it will fail. It is clear to me that many in the Palestinian leadership today see the peace process toward the goal of eliminating the State of Israel.

I suggest today that we get back to the basics. Peace is not possible while teaching children to hate and kill. Peace is not possible while persecuting those of other faiths. Peace is not possible while lionizing terrorism. We must stand up for freedom, security, and human dignity. We must stand up to ensure the security of Israel. We must stand up in the Congress, and we must insist that our President stand with us.

Today is the day to end American pressure on Israel to force a peace agreement. Today is the day to remember it is up to the people of Israel to determine their own fate—their own security. We should pressure those who fill children with slogans of hatred and holy war; we should pressure them to change. We should pressure those who torture; we should pressure them to change. We should pressure those who encourage and support terror and murder, and those who rejoice in hatred. That is where the pressure should be.

Now is the time, Mr. President, for a return to our principled stand. The only way to truly attain peace is to support freedom, democracy and justice, and oppose the cycle of hatred. We must face tyranny and oppression where it exists, condemn it, and stand up for peace—real peace based upon security, freedom, and a change of heart.

OCEAN SHIPPING REFORM

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, on February 26, 1999, the Federal Maritime Commission (FMC) completed its rulemaking to implement the Ocean Shipping Reform Act of 1998. The regulatory framework for the liner shipping

industry is now in place and ready for the May 1, 1999, start date.

The 1998 Act signals a paradigm shift in the conduct of the ocean liner business and its regulation by the FMC. Where ocean carrier pricing and service options were diluted by the conference system and "me too" requirements, an unprecedented degree of flexibility and choice will result. Where agency oversight once focused on using rigid systems of tariff and contract filing to scrutinize individual transactions, the "big picture" of ensuring the existence of competitive liner service by a healthy ocean carrier industry to facilitate fair and open maritime commerce among our trading partners will become the oversight priority.

Mr. President, as FMC Commissioner Ming Hsu recently told a large gathering of shippers and industry representatives, "This has been not only a long journey, but a long needed journey * * * With the passage of the Ocean Shipping Reform Act and the FMC's new regulations, I believe the maritime industry will be far less shackled by burdensome and needless regulations * * * I believe we can now look forward to an environment which gives you the freedom and flexibility to develop innovative solutions to your ever-changing ocean transportation needs." I couldn't agree more.

The FMC regulatory process bore some resemblance to the legislative process that preceded it. A few early steps started to head off in the wrong direction, but through honest dialogue among the industry and the government parties, the course was corrected and the intent of the 1998 Act was embodied in the regulations. Now the FMC faces the challenge of implementing the new regulations in a manner consistent with Congressional intent.

Mr. President, through the 1998 Act, the Congress directed the FMC to spend less effort attempting to regulate the day-to-day business of ocean carriers and spend more effort on countering truly market distorting activities. This shift is made possible by giving exporters and importers greater opportunity and ability to use the marketplace to satisfy their ocean shipping requirements through less government intervention.

Recent efforts by some countries to protect their domestic maritime industries by imposing restrictive trade practices indicates that this shift in emphasis is well-timed. I am particularly concerned about China's efforts to impose greater regulatory control over the ocean shipping industry as the rest of the world is heading in the opposite direction. While the Maritime Administration seem to be nearing an agreement eliminating unfair practices by Brazil, continued vigilance is required. As we are seeing with Japan's port practices, the problem can remain long after such an agreement is reached.

Mr. President, I should point out that paradigm shifts are often painful, but

enlightening, for involved organizations. To its credit, the FMC met the challenge of promulgating the new regulations by the March 1, 1999 deadline. Now, I recognize that Congress issues many deadlines for the Executive Branch, sometimes with little success. But I want to personally congratulate the FMC for its tremendous effort and responsiveness to complete these regulations on time. Not only did the FMC deliver its rules on time; the FMC's rules are clearly within the intent of Congress. I feel good about that.

I want to express my gratitude to the four FMC Commissioners, Chairman Hal Creel, Ming Hsu, John Moran, and Delmond Won, for their leadership and wisdom during this process. This band of four challenged the staff to think "outside the box" of the previous regulatory system and develop innovative methods to monitor the industry in a less intrusive manner. Also, I want to recognize the efforts of the FMC staff members who worked long and hard to meet Congress' deadline: George Bowers, Florence Carr, Jennifer Devine, Rachel Dickon-Matney, Bruce Dombrowski, Rebecca Fenneman, Vern Hill, Christopher Hughey, Amy Larson, David Miles, Tom Panebianco, Austin Schmitt, Matthew Thomas, Bryant VanBrakle, Ed Walsh, and Ted Zook. Their hard work and sweat will truly benefit this Nation by enabling industry and its customers to prepare for this new era of ocean shipping.

Mr. President, just as it took several years for the legislative process to bear fruit, I urge patience before evaluating the results of this rulemaking. I will continue to monitor the transition process for this fundamental change. The Ocean Shipping Reform Act can't fix international economic imbalances and uncertainties, but it will give the industry and its customers much-needed flexibility to work through many difficult situations.

Mr. President, The health of our Nation's economy depends on a healthy system for international trade, and therefore, a dependable ocean shipping industry. The FMC rules will provide the necessary certainty in a manner consistent with Congressional intent. Again, I salute the FMC for being responsive.

GRASSLEY-WYDEN INITIATIVE LETTER

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter sent to all Senators today addressing the procedures governing the use of holds, signed by the Democratic leader, Senator DASCHLE, and myself, be placed in the RECORD. This letter is a result of ongoing negotiations between Senators GRASSLEY and WYDEN, the Democratic leader and myself, beginning early in the 105th Congress, and encourages all Members to make their legislative holds known.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows: